Name of Applicant: New Prairie United
Overall Ranking: 86.6 out of 100

I. PROJECT ABSTRACT			(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points Abstract not provided or does not address any required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel)	**1-2 point range** Only includes 1-2 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel)	**3-4 point range** Includes 3-4 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel). Points reduced if exceeds two pages.	**5 points** Includes all 5 required elements (i.e., student needs; participants to be served; activities; outcomes; or key personnel). Points reduced if exceeds two pages.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:

 Four of the five required elements are directly addressed; participants to be served is vague (i.e., "our students"). While the applicant (previously served) indicates that the grant will help continue to expand after school opportunities, "new elements/programming" not specified.
Abstract does not exceed two pages.

II. COMPETITIVE PRIORITY POINTS	(Up to 10 POINTS)

A. Required Descriptions (Up to 2 Points)

0 points Descriptions not provided	**1 point** Just one of the two required descriptions provided (how application priority is met, OR origin of partnership)	**2 points** Both descriptions provided (how priority is met, and origin of partnership)

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

B. Organizational Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)

0 points Does not meet criteria	**4 points** Applicant meets criteria

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4**

Comments:

C. Programming Priority Points (Up to 4 Points)

0 points Does not meet criteria	**4 points** Meets criteria & area listed in Section V Goals & Objectives

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.3**

Comments:
Mentions both STEM and CCR in narrative, but seems as though focus is CCR (although not explicit).
Nothing, however, presented in Section V Goals substantiates a priority focus area.

Section II Total (averaged) Points out of 10 Possible: 7.3

III. NEED FOR PROJECT			(Up to 5 POINTS)

A. Data Evidence Demonstrating Need (Up to 3 Points)

0 points Data evidence not presented	**1 point** Data not provided for all three areas (i.e., achievement, demographics and behavioral)	**2 points** All three areas addressed (i.e., achievement, demographics & behavioral) and presented for EACH school to be served	**3 points** Achievement, demographic & behavioral data shown for EACH school (Attachment B) and demonstrates high need -- in both poverty levels and academic achievement.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.3**

Comments:
Attachment B shows only two of the five schools meet 40% poverty threshold (40% & 51%) and only one of the five schools has greater than 1% of EL students. Section III narrative describes demographic needs derived by size of district (spanning two counties, whereby students are isolated and do not otherwise have access to limited community resources available).

Academic needs are not addressed *by school* for elementary buildings, i.e., "Elementary schools have dropped an average of 7%-8% in Math and 4%-5% in ELA on ISTEP." Two elementary schools have "both fallen into the 60% ranges on ISTEP, a first in over five years." Percentage drops in ELA/Math for MS provided. HS achievement vaguely described, i.e., in past 3 years "HS has seen decrease in ECA/ISTEP achievement" (and students not scoring well or taking SAT; grad rate decrease by 4% last year).

B. Demonstrate Expanded Out-of-School Time Programming (Up to 1 Point)

0 points: Chart/graphic not provided	**1 point:** Chart/graphic provided showing increased time that addresses gaps for each school

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C. Describe Process for Assessing Needs/Services (Up to 1 Point)

0 points: Process and/or partner involvement not described	**1 point:** Process and partners involved are clearly described

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

Section III Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 4.3

IV. PARTNERSHIPS/COLLABORATIONS   (Up to 5 POINTS)

A. Describe Collaboration with Other Agencies/Funding Streams (Up to 1 point)

0 points: Not addressed or too vague to award point	**1 point:** Applicant demonstrates collaboration with other agencies, e.g., Title I, Child Nutrition, TANF, State/local programs

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

B. Describe How Each Partner's Contribution Supports Program (Up to 1 point)

0 points: Attachment F not submitted	**1 point:** Applicant completed and submitted Attachment F

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C. Memorandum of Understanding for Applicant & Key Partners (Up to 3 Points)

0 points	**1 point**	**2 points**	**3 points**
MOU/s detailing partner roles & responsibilities not provided. *NOTE: This is in addition to Attachment F.*	At least one MOU provided in Appendix, but does not fully articulate roles & responsibilities between applicant & partner	MOU/s provided in Appendix for all key partners offering *basic info* relevant to applicant/partner roles	MOU/s provided in Appendix for all key partners providing clearly-articulated expectations for applicant and for partner

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.6**

Comments:
 The *alignment of information* provided in Attachment F, the MOUs in the appendices, and Contractual

Services within the Budget was sometimes problematic. For example: Reviewer was unable to align contractual services within the budget to either Attachment F information or within the appendix MOUs for: (a) Academic Club Registrations $2,400; (b) Bus for Space Camp $7,000; or (c) Community Partner Festival $900.

Section IV Total (averaged) Points out of 5 Possible: 4.6

V. PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION   (Up to 30 points)

A. Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities and Assessments (Up to 8 points)

0-2 point range	3-6 point range	7-8 point range
Table overviewing Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures, Activities & Assessments includes *less than* <u>all three</u> of the <u>required goals</u>, i.e., (1) student achievement, (2) behavioral, & (3) family involvement	Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, *if applicable.* At least <u>two objectives</u> provided <u>per goal</u>. Activities are aligned with each objective; performance measures include numerical targets and are each connected to a specific measurement strategy	*Includes all three required goals, i.e., achievement, behavioral and family involvement -- as well as HS, pre-K, or summer goals, if applicable.* *At least two objectives provided per goal.* **Highly engaging** *activities are aligned with objectives;* ***challenging performance measures*** *include numerical targets and are each connected to* a specific measurement strategy

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **6.6**

Comments:
All 3 required goals addressed, with at least 2 objectives each, and summer goals were included. Multiple measures: NWEA, grades, ISTEP+, records, surveys. Performance measures appear attainable, although some not viewed as challenging.

B. Evidence of Previous Success (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided in **APPENDIX**.	If **previous grantee**: Some description of previous attendance rates and program benefits. If **new grantee**: Limited information on supporting student retention; and general strategies for providing academic assistance.	If **previous grantee**: Clearly documented quantitative evidence of past 30+ and 60+ attendance rates and academic outcomes (e.g., ISTEP+, DIBELS, NWEA) showing increased performance. If **new grantee**: Specific activities provided to support student recruitment and attendance and to provide academic assistance.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1.6**

Comments:
Evidence presented in Appendices, p 117. Applicant struggles with increased performance.

C. Design Requirements (Up to 20 total points for Items 1-8)

C-1. Requirements of GEPA 427 (Up to 1 point)

0 points	1 point
Information not provided in the APPENDIX or within proposal narrative.	Specific equitability issue identified and addressed (either in Appendix or proposal narrative) to reduce program barrier

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**

Comments:

C-2. Targeted Students and Their Families (Up to 3 points)

1 point	2 point	3 points
Only partial information provided (i.e., only Attachment B *List of Schools* submitted; OR only narrative supporting criteria & process to recruit students provided). If *List of Schools* (Attachment B) not submitted, zero points.	Identifies Title 1 and non-Title 1 schools (Attachment B); <u>and</u> describes (in narrative) general strategies for recruiting students. Justifies inclusion of any schools with less than 40% poverty (*if applicable*).	Submits Attachment B (identifying schools). Narrative describes specific strategies for recruiting students; and justifies inclusion of schools with less than 40% poverty (*if applicable*). Majority of served schools demonstrate HIGH NEED (e.g., D/F schools; poverty rates greater than 50%)

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.3**

Comments:
Does not meet expectations to score the full 3 points since majority of served schools do not demonstrate high need (in 21st CCLC anticipated poverty or achievement thresholds).

C-3. Dissemination of Information (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided	Outlines general steps the applicant will take to disseminate general program information.	Provides specific steps to disseminate detailed program information including: service description, program location, and how to access the program.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

C-4. Communication with Schools (Up to 3 Points)

1 point	2 points	3 points
Less than all four topics are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts). Zero points if none of 4 topics.	*All four topics* are addressed (nonpublic students; accessing academic records; sharing student progress; and alignment of in-school and out-of-school-time efforts)	*All four* topics addressed; and applicant demonstrates its strong understanding and commitment to appropriately obtain & use student data to inform efforts (e.g., specifies strategies for sharing information with teachers & parents; detailed MOU included in Appendix -- if applicant is not an LEA).

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.6**

Comments:
Nonpublic declines.
All four topics described; how student data will be used to inform efforts not specifically addressed (p40).

C-5. Parental Involvement, Family Literacy, and Related Family Educational Attainment (Up to 3 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
Information not provided	Plan describes at least one, solid activity to engage parents in the program.	Evaluation of community needs/resources conducted; and multiple activities planned to engage parents	Evaluation of needs/resources conducted; and multiple activities specified to engage parents; and needs of working parents considered.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2.6**

Comments:
Applicant generally meets expectations; no "comprehensive, but achievable strategy." Monthly meetings to address needs identified via survey.

C-6. USDA Approved Snacks/Meals for 21st CCLC Participants (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided – or Applicant does not offer (optional) snacks/meals to program participants	Only one of two required elements provided (i.e., how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed to sites; OR specification that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines	Both required elements included: how snacks/meals will be acquired & distributed; and that snacks/meals meet USDA and IDOE guidelines

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

C-7. Weekly Schedule (Up to 5 points)

0 points	1-3 point range	4-5 point range
Information not provided	General weekly schedule provided that meets minimum hours of operation requirements for grade levels served. Applicant intends to also operate during summer OR extended-breaks, but did not submit separate weekly schedule.	Detailed weekly schedule provided for EACH site that meets minimum hours of operation requirements; Elem & MS schedules reflect diverse and engaging activities (academic, behavioral, enrichment/recreational); Separate schedules are provided for summer and extended breaks (if applicable).

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**

Comments:
This is an afterschool and summer program (not also a *before* school program, as indicated on application page 5). Required number of hours per week met for afterschool elementary, middle and high schools – and for summer elementary programs. Schedules provided for each school (afterschool & summer). "Behavioral" elements difficult for reviewer to confirm within daily schedules.

C-8. 21st CCLC Learning Center Messaging (Up to 1 point)

0 points	1 point
No description for meeting the requirement	Applicant describes how it will meet the requirement

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **1**
Comments:

Section V Total (averaged) Points out of 30 Possible: 26.3

VI. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 points range	3-4 point range	5 points
Information not provided	Includes one-dimensional description and plan for providing PD (e.g., focus is solely on staff attendance at State and national meetings or conferences – but no PD plan is articulated to support specific needs of center's staff, aligned to its program goals & objectives)	Includes detailed plan for providing PD; connects PD to program quality and goals of project; PD strategies center around State/national workshops and trainings, but also include anticipated trainings (e.g., First Aid, vendor-provided trainings to support staff use of software instructional programs). May include a detailed chart of planned PD activities.	Needs of program staff assessed and PD is a tiered-approach, addressing needs of specific staff roles (i.e., leadership vs. instructional needs). Multiple approaches will support needs (State & national workshops/conferences; and ongoing trainings to support locally-identified needs). Plan addresses initial kick-off, turn-over and ongoing training for new and veteran staff; connects PD to program quality and goals of the project; includes detailed chart of planned PD activities.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**
Comments:
Strong commitment to administrative training (director & site coordinators, via IDOE State/regional trainings, IAN Summit, IYI, monthly regional meetings for providers, NWEA software training), less for direct service staff (5 hours of PD via online modules, webinars, CPR & food service, Geminus CCR-&R).

VII. EVALUATION (Up to 15 POINTS)

A. Identification of Local Evaluator (Up to 3 points)

1 point	2 points	3 points
Applicant intends to hire local evaluator, but entity not yet selected	Local evaluator identified (external to the program) with evaluation experience	Selected local evaluator with demonstrated expertise in data analyses, report writing, and afterschool program knowledge

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**
Comments:

B. Evaluation Design (Up to 10 points)

0-2 point range	3-5 point range	6-8 point range	9-10 point range
Plan is not provided -- or of insufficient detail to convey understanding of local evaluation expectations	Some key elements are included in local evaluation design plan, but several descriptions are missing or vaguely presented	Plan demonstrates understanding of expectations – with some key elements better articulated than others. Applicant must address all Section V performance measures & assessments to score in this range (or higher).	Plan clearly articulated. Includes evaluator's roles; addresses collection/analyses of all Section V performance measures & assessments; details eval implementation timeframes; and specifies how findings are shared and used to improve program

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **9.3**
Comments:

Page 51 describes performance measures for ELA & Math performance (from Section V). Should also include 3% increase/or better on ELA and 3% or better on Math (ISTEP or its equivalent, ILEARN). More details on sharing results with partners/stakeholders would make this stronger.

C. Annual Reporting (Up to 2 points)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Information not provided. Applicant does not address its obligation to submit reports/data for both State and federal reporting	Applicant adequately addresses at least one key annual reporting obligation, e.g., local program evaluator's report submitted to IDOE at end of each program year (showing program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures)	Applicant understands its obligation to submit reports/data to the IDOE (i.e., annual local program evaluator's report with program quality evidence, attendance trends and progress toward performance measures; and data required in EZ reports). Grantee also uses IN-QPSA online self-assessment, to locally rate its performance.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments:

Section VII Total (averaged) Points out of 15 Possible: 14.3

VIII. SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 points	3-4 points	5 points
Information not provided	Applicant affirms that its program will align with Indiana Academic Standards but does not adequately convey how that will occur	Applicant provides concrete examples of how its program will align to Indiana Academic Standards (e.g., collaborative planning between regular classroom teachers and extended-learning-time staff; evidenced-based software used for literacy support)	Strong evidence (multiple strategies) provided supporting extended-learning-time program's alignment with Indiana Academic Standards via routine coordination of planning, PD and academic efforts between program and school/district staff where students attend

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5**

Comments:

IX. SUSTAINABILITY PLAN (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1 point	3 points	5 points
Information not provided	Outlines existing partnerships and a general plan for sustaining program levels beyond the grant.	Outlines existing partnerships and potential partnerships; and identifies potential future funding sources (e.g., general funds/Title I)	Outlines existing partnerships, expanding partnerships & potential partnerships; provides a well-conceived plan for sustaining program levels through increased local capacity and/or future funding sources. Establishes sustainability goal for Year One programming.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**

Comments:
All anticipated elements addressed, but Year One goal not specified.

X. SAFETY AND TRANSPORTATION (Up to 5 POINTS)

0 points	1-2 point range	3-4 point range	5 points
Information not provided	Provides some general staffing requirements (e.g., criminal background checks) and commits to providing students' transportation home after program	Demonstrates detailed program safety plan (background checks on file/confidential); district/agency staffing requirements met; required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if facility not located in school); and safe transportation provided to/from center and home that meets needs of working families	Demonstrates detailed program safety plan (background checks on file/confidential); district/agency staffing requirements met; required parent sign-in/out; MOU provided (if facility not located in school); and safe transportation provided to/from center and home that meets needs of working families; and addresses use of IAN Safety Standards

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **5**

Comments:

XI. BUDGET FORM/NARRATIVE, DETAILS & SUMMARY			(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points Budget Form (Budget Narrative) not completed by applicant.	**1-2 point range** Some budget narrative pieces completed, but not all. *Examples*: (a) key anticipated costs not reflected in budget (e.g., evaluation and PD costs missing); OR (b) budget includes cost items not substantiated in proposal narratives; OR (c) excessive line items for equipment costs (without solid justification and intent to obtain IDOE pre-approval).	**3-4 point range** Budget narrative includes all anticipated line items (e.g., staffing, PD, evaluation, contracted services; transportation). Narratives adequately explain costs that are aligned to activities described in proposed RFP. Costs appear reasonable and permissible (and some items may require pre-approval by IDOE). Budget Summary is completed correctly and matches costs in Budget Form/Narrative.	**5 points** Exemplary budget narrative clearly articulates all anticipated line items (e.g., staffing, PD, evaluation, contracted services; transportation). Narratives summarize costs that are clearly-aligned to activities in the proposed RFP. All costs appear reasonable and permissible. No errors on Budget Summary; costs match those in Budget Form/Narrative.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **3**

Comments:
Overall, costs appear reasonable and allocable and aligned to programmatic strategies described within the proposal. Supplies appear appropriate, although $2,400 budgeted for balance balls, pillows, bean bag chairs & cushions may be considered by IDOE as *Equipment* costs, not Supplies.

Note that applicant indicates IDOE pre-approved costs for: Space Camp hotel (Travel) and one lap-top (Equipment).

Reviewer was unable to align Contractual services within the budget to either Attachment F information or within the appendix MOUs for the following: (a) Academic Club Registrations $2,400; (b) Bus of Space Camp $7,000; or (c) Community Partner Festival $900

XII. GRANT PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION			(Up to 5 POINTS)
0 points Not organized in prescribed format. Program Narrative section far exceeded *30-page maximum* (i.e., 35 or more pages)	**1-2 point range** Grant materials are provided, but not in the sequence requested. *Abstract* exceeds 2 pages/*Program Narrative* section exceeds 35 pages; Did not double-space/use 12-point font.	**3-4 point range** Grant materials provided in sequence requested. *Abstract* and *Program Narratives* do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.	**5 points** Exceptionally well organized with materials provided in sequence requested. *Abstract* and *Program Narratives* do not exceed maximum (2 pages/35 pages). Proposal double-space/12-pt font; and pages numbered with identifying headers on each page.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.6**

Comments:
Alignment of Attachment F and MOUs/Appendix caused some confusion, most notably when working to justify costs in budget. Minutes confirming authorized individual not attached in Appendices.

Name of Applicant: New Prairie United

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
I. Project Abstract	5	3
II. Competitive Priority Points	10	7.3
III. Need for Project	5	4.3
IV. Partnerships/Collaboration	5	4.6
V. Program Design and Implementation	30	26.3
VI. Professional Development Plan	5	4.6
VII. Evaluation Plan	15	14.3
VIII. Support for Strategic Priorities	5	5
IX. Sustainability Plan	5	4.6
X. Safety and Transportation	5	5
XI. Budget Narrative	5	3
XII. Proposal Organization	5	4.6
TOTAL POINTS	**100** Total Points Possible	**86.6**